

Amendments to the Drawings

Please replace Fig. 1B, contained in drawing sheet one with the attached replacement figure.

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were previously pending in this application, with claims 7-24 being withdrawn from consideration due to a restriction requirement. By this amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 7-24 without prejudice or disclaimer and amending claims 1 and 6. As a result claims 1-6 are pending for examination with claims 1 and 6 being independent claims.

Support for these amendments to claims 1 and 6 is provided, for example, in Applicant's specification as originally filed in paragraphs [0025-0028]. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Drawing Objections

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because Fig. 1B did not include the reference sign 52 mentioned in paragraph 24, line 2 of Applicant's specification as originally filed. Enclosed herewith is a replacement drawing sheet that overcomes this objection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated over U.S. Patent No. U.S.6,967,728 to Vidyanand (hereinafter Vidyanand).

Each of independent claims 1 and 6 has been amended to further describe the manner in which each object of a plurality of objects associated with items of the standard interface is linked to a respective object of a plurality of objects associated with items of the customized user interface. Further, each of independent claims 1 and 6 has also been amended to recite an additional step of setting a parameter of each of the items of the standard interface to a value that hides it from the view of a user. Support for these amendments is provided, for example, in Applicant's specification as originally filed in paragraphs [0025-0028]. Because these aspects of Applicant's invention are not disclosed or suggested by Vidyanand, each of claims 1 and 6, as now presented, clearly and patentably distinguishes over Vidyanand.

Vidyanand is directed to a system for supporting multiple platforms with common personal preferences for printer drivers, the set of common personal preferences being reusable and capable of being moved from one printer driver to another. (Col. 3, lines 28-31.) As described in Vidyanand, sets 16 of printer driver preference settings 18 may be transferred

between computers by file transfer, by direct transfer, by email or any other electronic export or import method. (Col. 4, lines 53-59.) Once transferred to another computer, and/or modified by a user, the printer driver preference settings 18 may be used by a printer driver 14 that is linked to an application program. (Col. 7, lines 33-35, lines 44-47, and col. 8, lines 8-11.)

At page 4, the Office action asserted that Vidyanand discloses a method that includes “linking the first object to the second object through a software interface, the software interface for facilitating communication between the first object and the second object,” referencing Figs. 9 and 10, and column 7, lines 44-47 and column 8, lines 8-18. As described with respect to Fig. 8 (at col. 7, lines 33-35), Vidyanand discloses *an active application 20* (such as Word® or Excel®) on a client computer 12 *that is linked to a printer driver 14* for re-usable and transferable printer preferences 18. Fig. 9 of Vidyanand pictorially illustrates a detailed view of the user interface 50 of the printer driver 14 which is linked to the active application 20 (see col. 7, lines 44-47), and Fig. 10 of Vidyanand pictorially illustrates a settings submenu 98 of the user interface 50 of the printer driver 14 which is linked to an active application 20 on the client computer 12 (see col. 8, lines 8-11). In Vidyanand, the only discussion of the linking of one object to another is that described with respect to the linking of the printer driver 14 to an active application. (See col. 4, lines 9-18; col. 7, lines 33-35 and 44-47; and col. 8, lines 8-11.)

Although Vidyanand discloses a printer driver 14 that is linked to an active application 20 on the client computer 12, Vidyanand fails to disclose, teach, or suggest linking each first object of a plurality of first objects to a respective second object of a plurality of second objects as now recited in each of independent claims 1 and 6. Furthermore, nowhere does Vidyanand disclose, teach, or suggest a step of setting a parameter of each of the items of the standard interface to a value that hides it from the view of a user.

For example, as now presented, claim 1 is directed to a method of customizing a standard user interface associated with a universal printer driver. The method comprises steps of associating each item of a first plurality of items of a standard user interface data structure to a respective first object of a first plurality of first objects, associating each item of a second plurality of items of a customized user interface to a respective second object of a second plurality of second objects, linking each respective first object of the first plurality of first objects to a respective second object of the second plurality of second objects through a software interface, setting a parameter of each respective item of the first plurality of items of the standard

user interface data structure to a value that hides the respective item from view of a user, and displaying the customized user interface. As further recited in claim 1, each first object of the first plurality of first objects has a first object interface and each second object of the second plurality of objects of second objects has a second object interface, and the software interface facilitates communication between each respective first and second object that are linked together by linking the first object interface of the respective first object to the second object interface of the respective second object.

Although Vidyanand discloses a printer driver 14 that is linked to an application program, that is the only linking disclosed in Vidyanand. Indeed, the only mention of the word “link” to be found in Vidyanand is the linking of the printer driver 14 to the active application 20 on the client computer described with respect to Figs 8-10. (See col. 4, lines 9-18; col. 7, lines 33-35 and 44-47; and col. 8, lines 8-11.) Nowhere does Vidyanand disclose or suggest linking each first object of a first plurality of objects associated with items of a standard interface to a respective second object of a plurality of second objects associated with items of a customized use interface in the manner recited in claim 1. Accordingly, because Vidyanand does not disclose, teach, or suggest the linking of each of a plurality of first objects to a respective second object of a plurality of second objects as recited in claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Vidyanand and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, claim 1 additionally recites a step of setting a parameter of each respective item of the first plurality of items of the standard user interface data structure to a value that hides the respective item from view of a user. This further aspect of Applicant’s invention, described in paragraph [0028] of Applicant’s specification as originally filed, is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Vidyanand. Accordingly, claim 1 as now presented patentably distinguishes over Vidyanand for at least this additional reason.

Claims 2-5 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and patentably distinguish over Vidyanand for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 6 has been amended to include limitations similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. Claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Vidyanand for reasons similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Vidyanand does not disclose, teach, or suggest computer software, residing on a computer-readable storage medium, that comprises a set of instructions that cause a computer to customize a standard user interface

associated with a universal printer driver by linking each of a plurality of first objects associated with a first plurality of items to a respective second object of a plurality of second objects associated with a second plurality of items in the manner recited in claim 6. Nor does Vidyanand disclose, teach, or suggest setting a parameter of each respective item of the first plurality of items of the standard user interface data structure to a value that hides the respective item from view of a user. Accordingly, because Vidyanand does not disclose, teach, or suggest these aspects of Applicant's invention as recited in claim 6, the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested. This application should now be in condition for allowance; a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an authorization to charge a deposit account submitted herewith, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50/2762.

Respectfully submitted,
Oliver H. Foehr, Applicant

By: /Robert A. Skrivanek, Jr./
Robert A. Skrivanek, Jr., Reg. No.: 41,316
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
One Main Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
United States of America
Telephone: 617-395-7014
Facsimile: 617-395-7070